

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 and 14-17 are pending. Claims 1-7 and 14-17 are rejected by the Examiner.

Claims 1-3, 5, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Feinleib (US Patent No. 6,272,532).

As stated in the Office Action, Feinleib discloses "extracting and parsing the configuration instructions from the e-mail message." As amended, claims 1 and 14 require that the commands be extracted from the e-mail message "without parsing." This is supported in the specification on page 4, lines 4-9. It is therefore submitted that claims 1 and 14 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

With regard to claim 2, Feinleib does not teach receiving instructions that can be extracting without parsing at a mail server on the appliance. With regard to claim 3, Feinleib does not teach receiving instructions that can be extracting without parsing at a mail server, wherein the mail server is an IMAP server, or an SMTP server.

With regard to claim 5, Feinleib does not teach connecting the appliance to a network to receive an e-mail message containing instructions that are extracted without parsing.

With regard to claim 15, Feinleib does not teach that a computing device that is an network appliance executes instructions that result in the appliance receiving an e-mail, extracting instructions from the e-mail without parsing, and configuring the appliance.

It is therefore submitted that claims 2-3, 5 and 15 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 4, 6-7, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feinleib.

With regard to claim 4, Feinleib does not show, teach nor suggest that a mail daemon runs on the appliance, such that the device is always connected to the network so the daemon can monitor e-mail for the device, wherein the e-mails contain instructions that are extracted without parsing.

With regard to claims 6 and 7, Feinleib does not show, teach nor suggest receiving e-mail at a mail client on the appliance, where the e-mail includes instructions that are extracted without parsing, nor where the mail client communicates with a mail server on a network to receive the e-mails.

With regard to claims 16 and 17, Feinleib does not teach, show nor suggest any electronic appliance other than an e-mail client, much less that the client receives its configuration instructions by e-mail such that they are extracted without parsing for either a remote camera or an Internet radio player. It is therefore submitted that claims 4, 6-7 and 16 and 17 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



---

Julie L. Reed  
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.  
1030 SW Morrison Street  
Portland, OR 97205  
(503) 222-3613